

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated March 1, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. The drawings and the specification have been amended to correct errors. The amendment is fully supported by the disclosure and no new matter has been added by the amendment.

### ***Drawing Objections***

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failing to show the “layers of turn insulation” as claimed in claims 4 and 14. FIG. 7 has been corrected to illustrate the layers of turn insulation with reference numeral 71. It is respectfully submitted that this does not constitute new matter, since the turn insulation is described as being disposed as indicated by reference numeral 71, at least in paragraph [0025]. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings.

### ***Specification Amendment***

The specification has been amended to add reference numeral 71, which was omitted in the original specification.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)***

#### **Claims 1-7**

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kilgore et al., U.S. Patent No. 2,333,575 (hereinafter “Kilgore”).

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Kilgore fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, individual turns of a winding are stacked in a parallel sided radial slot, wherein a first turn of the winding has a first thickness and a second turn of the winding has a second thickness thicker than said first thickness. In other words, turns of a **same winding** in a same slot have different thicknesses.

In contrast, Kilgore merely discloses adjacent slots housing adjacent windings, in which **the adjacent windings** have bars of different thicknesses (see Fig. 8, elements 82' and 84'). Thus, Kilgore fails to teach a first turn of the winding has a first thickness and a second turn of the winding has a second thickness thicker than said first thickness, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Kilgore. Claims 2-7 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and thus include all the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claims 2-7 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

#### Claims 9-16

Claims 9-16 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kilgore. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended claim 9 to recite, *inter alia*, a first copper turn has a first thickness and a second copper turn disposed in a same slot as the first copper turn has a second thickness thicker than said first thickness. As stated above, Kilgore fails to teach turns disposed in a same slot as having different thicknesses. Thus, Kilgore fails to teach a first copper turn has a first thickness and a second copper turn disposed in a same slot as the first copper turn has a second thickness thicker than said first thickness, as claimed in claim 9.

Accordingly, claim 9 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Kilgore. Claims 10-16 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9 and thus include all the limitations of claim 9. Thus, claims 10-16 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 9.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kilgore. As stated above, independent claims 1 and 9 are patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Kilgore. Dependent claims 8 and 17 depend directly from corresponding independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, and thus include all the limitations of the corresponding independent claims. Thus, claims 8 and 17 are allowable for at least the reasons given above for claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections of claims 8 and 17.


***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By:   
Chad L. Thorson  
Reg. No. 55,675  
Confirmation No. 1910  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: April 28, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 7. This sheet, which include FIGS. 6 and 7, replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 6 and 7. In FIG. 7, previously omitted element 71 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet